



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of all Greek cosmology: *ex nihilo nihil fit*. Hence γενέσθαι must refer to the formation of individual things out of the eternal stuff, and its subject οἷθεν τῶν ἐόντων is in line with this interpretation. In the latter part of the passage the author uses the expression συνέστα ὁ κόσμος, by which he means that the ordered universe which we see is a construction. The action which brought it about is spoken of in different fragments under the terms ἀρμόχθη, συναρμόχθη, συγκεκλείσθαι. Hence γενέσθαι here is the generic word for the process of fitting together or harmonizing the different primary elements (ἀρχαί) into particular objects which can be known.

The significance of the whole passage would then be this: we really know only things that have number, that is, measurable form; and hence we cannot know the underlying substance of these things, for that does not admit of human measurement. But, though we do not know it, we may be said to know about it, and we may be theoretically certain that it forms the basis of existing knowable objects, since these objects could not exist without substance. The subject of the whole fragment is nature or the conditions of existence, and Philolaus is trying to show how the ordered universe that we know came into its present condition. It arose, he says, by the action of harmony on a basic substance, which we do not know but must infer. This substance consisted of different primary elements, and harmony fitted these together in such a way that nature φύσις turns out to be an ordered world κόσμος.

ROBERT SCOON

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

NOTE ON ISOCRATES' *NICOCLES* 21

There is a difficulty in the text of Isocrates' *Nicocles* 21, which none of the editors has noted. The passage is as follows: τοῖς γὰρ κοινοῖς οἱ μὲν ὡς ιδίοις, οἱ δ' ὡς ἀλλοτρίοις προσέχουσι τὸν νοῦν. It is one of a long series of antitheses (extending through 18–21) which set forth the advantages of the rule of kings over that of citizens in a democracy or an oligarchy. The meaning here, as the context shows, must be: kings give attention to affairs of state as if they were their own concern; citizens in other governments, as if they were the concern of others. But in all the other antitheses in the midst of which this one is set, οἱ μὲν is used consistently for officers or ministers in a democratic or an oligarchical state, while οἱ δέ is used for kings. It is, therefore, hardly conceivable that in the single sentence above quoted so careful a stylist as Isocrates could have reversed the order. It is easier to assume that the words ιδίοις and ἀλλοτρίοις have somehow changed places. The mere carelessness of a copyist may have been to blame, or the transposition may have been due to a mental confusion produced by the fact that the doctrine here stated is contrary to Isocrates' own tributes to the old Athenian

democracy as a government whose citizens gave attention to the affairs of state as though they were their own, or even sacrificed their private advantage for the public good. See, especially, *Panegyricus* 76 and *Areopagiticus* 24.

GEORGE NORLIN

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

ILIAD v. 885-87

ἦ τέ κε δηρὸν
αὐτοῦ πῆματ' ἔπασχον ἐν αἰνῆσιν νεκάδεσσιν,
ἦ κε ζῶς ἀμενηνὸς ἕα χαλκοῦ τυπῆσιν.

In *Classical Philology*, XVII, 142, Mr. Nicholas E. Crosby proposes the reading ἦ κ' ἐν ζῶσ' for the Vulgate ἦ κε ζῶς, in order to obtain a satisfactory contrast between 885 f. and 887. The contrast between *dead* and *alive* he rejects as impossible in the case of a god; but the contrast which he does recognize—*among the dead* and *among the living*—can hardly be looked upon as more acceptable. The clue to the correct understanding of these lines is in the word ἀμενηνός. This word is not found elsewhere in the *Iliad*; and in the *Odyssey* it is always used in the phrase (νεκῶν) ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα, except in *Od.* xix. 562, where it appears as an epithet of dreams. It naturally has the connotation of death, and the combination ζῶς ἀμενηνός, "a live ghost," is an effective oxymoron. The contrast in the lines is between *dead* and *alive*, but the idea of death is in the second member, not in the first. Of course, Ares cannot die, but he can do the next thing to it; and the lines have the familiar humorous turn which Homer always enjoys when his divinities become unmanageably anthropomorphic. "Either I should have had a long, hard fight, or I should have been—alive, to be sure,—but still as good as dead, from the spear-strokes." Whether this interpretation is sound or not, Mr. Crosby's note will at any rate make it necessary for the commentators and translators to reconsider this passage. It may be that the proposed interpretation will persuade some critics that the three lines (or 887 alone) are not spurious after all, in spite of the objectionable ζῶς.

IVAN M. LINFORTH

ALEXANDER, THE SON OF DEMETRIUS POLIORCETES

Professor M. Rostovtzeff, in his recent study *A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B.C.* (Madison, Wis., 1922), pages 20-21, has called attention to a certain Alexander mentioned in an unpublished papyrus of the Zenon collection (P. Lond. Inv. 2087) and has suggested that this man "residing in Alexandria as a hostage" is to be identified with Alexander, son of Lysimachus and his Odrysian wife. It is evident, as Rostovtzeff points out,